08/809723

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/809,723	05/21/97	OHKI	H 18-971-0-PCT

EXAMINER

18M1/0828

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND
MAIER AND NEUSTADT
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON VA 22202

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1811	5

DATE MAILED: 08/28/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☑ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☑ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐ _____.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☑ Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

   Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☑ Claims 1-19 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____. has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

1. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 provides for the use of a compound or a salt thereof as a medicament, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966)

Claim 18 is a duplicate of claim 1 because claim 18 has no further structural limitation that would distinguish the compounds recited in claim 18 from those recited in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshiro et al (EPA 0462531) or Toshrio et al (USP 5,376634).

The present invention relates to compounds that have the generally formula set forth on pages 2-5 of the specification. The instant compounds have antimicrobial activity. Additionally, the invention also relates to a process of making said compounds.

Toshiro et al (EPA 0462531) teaches antimicrobial compounds which read on the compound of the present invention, especially when R1 is acyl, R2 is hydroxyl, and R3 is hydrosulfonyloxy, and R4 is carbamoyl provided that R1 is not palimitoyl . The compounds of the present invention fall with the scope of the invention taught by Toshiro et al. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to preferentially selective the appropriate radicals needed to prepare the compounds of the present invention. Furthermore it would be within the skill of the art and therefore obvious to use the process taught by Toshiro et al to prepare the peptides of the instant invention, wherein the compounds have antimicrobial activity.

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and © may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,374634. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention are co-extensive. Essentially, the present invention relates to compounds, pharmaceutical compositions, and a methods of making compounds set forth on pages 2-5 of the specification. The compounds of the instant invention fall within the scope of the invention taught by Toshiro et al; therefore it is within the skill of the art to preferentially select the appropriate radicals for preparing the compounds of the invention, wherein the compounds have antimicrobial activity.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However,

this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applicants Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Marshall whose telephone number is (703) 308-1030.

Sgm
August 26, 1997

CECILIA J. TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1800

Application No. 08/809723

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application do not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

☑ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 O.G. May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.

☑ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 CFR 1.821(c).

☑ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e).

☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked-up "Raw Sequence Listing."

☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 CFR 1.825(d).

☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e).

☐ 7.

Other: _____

Applicant must provide:

☑ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing"

☑ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification

☑ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d)

For questions regarding compliance with these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-1123
For CRF submission help, call (703) 308-4212
For PatentIn software help, call (703) 557-0400

Please return a copy of this notice with your response.